

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,590	86,590 10/17/2003		Tatsuomi Nakayama	023971-0326	9372
22428	7590	09/20/2004		EXAMINER	
FOLEY AN	ID LAR	DNER	NGUYEN, DUNG V		
SUITE 500 3000 K STR	EET NW	r		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	ON, DO	20007	3723		
				DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		0 1/
Office Asticus Communication	10/686,590	NAKAYAMA ET AL. W'
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dung V Nguyen	3723
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
	— s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under l	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application	l .	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	= ' '	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 H.S.C. & 110/a	_(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document)-(d) or (i).
2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received in Applicat	ion No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	•	ed in this National Stage
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ' ''	ad
Coo and anabriou abtailed office abtion for a list	. or and documed dopids not receive	
Attachment(s)	🗖	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/17/03</u> .	6) Other:	

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Oshidari et al (USPN 6,527,667). Claim 24 is a Product-by-Process claim and MPEP 2113 states that Product-by-Process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the product. Oshidari et al discloses a traction drive rolling element 1 including a traction surface 1a having microscopic crowned-projections having a height of not more than 3 µm (note Fig.1, 10, col. 8, lines 10-42, col. 15, lines 9-16).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/686,590

Art Unit: 3723

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Oshidari et al (USPN 6,527,667). Oshidari et al discloses a traction drive rolling element 1 comprising a traction surface 1a having an arcuate profile in cross section taken along a rotation axis A, microscopic crowned-projections disposed along the arcuate profile, the microscopic crowned-projections having a height of not more than 3 µm and a round corner portion (note Fig.1, 10, col. 8, lines 10-42, col. 15, lines 9-16). However, Oshidari et al does not disclose a rounded corner portion has a radius of curvature ranging from 2 mm to 10 mm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a rounded corner portion has a radius of curvature ranging from 2 mm to 10 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-23 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chiba et al and Nanbu et al are cited to show traction drive rolling elements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung V Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J Hail can be reached on 703-308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/686,590

Art Unit: 3723

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DVN

September 17, 2004

DUNG VAN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER